

because we have said if he says that, he has to take it to court and prove it. So instead, he says that this delegation of authority at best is highly suspect. In Section 2 he further indicates that this is an expansion of a definition that I have felt and that the Attorney General indicated when the amendment was adopted, constitutional amendment, is suspect and confusing. In section 3 he says he has no way of knowing what they intend to do with the revolving fund. Well, if I have a revolving fund of money and I am dealing with a bunch of private developers, it is pretty hard not to understand that that fund will...those monies will be used by those developers, and that being the case he said if that money is made available to anyone other than the state, it is flatly a violation of Article VIII of the Constitution. I cannot help but go back to what was originally Section 14 and later became Section 15 of LB 158, where this Legislature in one fell swoop adopted Article 18-2100, 46 sections and within that adoption there are so many conflicts with the rest of 158 that it is truly unfortunate. Now my concern is not for the bill. My concern is no longer for the concept of the bill. The Lincoln Chamber, who would like very much to take the taxpayers' money and build a marble palace for Lincoln, I cannot fault them. I would like to have your money. I can build more things that will do more good than you can point a finger at as long as I don't have to pay for it. But here again in the midst of complaints of high property tax, we are going to take what should have been property tax and send it back to a private individual, namely the developer. Now in the bill, 158, we are allowed to do many things, and yet when we adopted the 46 sections in 158 in one line without any interpretation, we said that all that money could be used for was to acquire the land and prepare it for development. Now we are building skyways from the First National Bank over to whatever is going to be erected on the Cornhusker lot. Small wonder the Chamber of Commerce headed by Burnie Yates is here saying this is a fine idea. Small wonder they bring you over and point out all the advantages, but the thing they do not point out is that we have serious constitutional conflicts. 2106 says you can levy three-quarters of a mill. That is not what that amendment said, that constitutional amendment. What we are going to do is create knowingly in the face of the Attorney General's opinions to the contrary a liability that could cost somebody, the Lincoln Chamber of Commerce notwithstanding. We have a bill that is, has been faulty since the constitutional amendment was set up, and we are exposing according to Lincoln's own figures, somebody to a charge of constitutionality